

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

THE HON. JOHN R. ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SIXTH  
CIRCUIT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-01894-ABJ

**JOINT STATUS REPORT**

Pursuant to the Court's Minute Order of March 4, 2019, the parties hereby submit this status report describing the status of proceedings before the Judicial Council of the Sixth Circuit.

1. On June 27, 2019, the Judicial Council of the Sixth Circuit issued an order dismissing the complaint of judicial misconduct against Judge Adams, which is attached as Exhibit 1. The issuance of this order was consistent with the Judicial Council's order of June 27, 2018, wherein it stated that it would review this matter within one year.

2. The Court has previously held Defendants' Motion to Dismiss on Mootness Grounds [ECF No. 20] in abeyance pending completion of the Judicial Council's review of the underlying proceeding.

3. Plaintiff respectfully requests that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss on Mootness Grounds be held in abeyance for a further 60 days to allow Plaintiff to consider his response.

4. Defendants maintain that the Court may presently decide Defendants' Motion to Dismiss on Mootness Grounds because the Judicial Council's review of the matter has now concluded and the underlying complaint has been dismissed. If, however, the Court, out of an abundance of caution, were to continue to hold the motion in abeyance until after August 8,

2019, when the time to petition for further review of the June 27, 2019 Order would run pursuant to Rule 22(c) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, Defendants would not object. In its June 27, 2019 Order, the Judicial Council “upon review conclude[d] that no further misconduct by Judge Adams has occurred.” The Judicial Council further stated that, as of June 27, 2019, its “jurisdiction over this matter is terminated, and the challenged requirements of the February 22, 2016 order, including the directive that Judge Adams undergo a mental health evaluation, are no longer in effect.” Should the Court desire a supplemental brief on the impact of the June 27, 2019 Order on the mootness analysis, Defendants are prepared to provide it as directed by the Court, if necessary after Judge Adams’s time to take any action in response to the Order has elapsed.

Dated: July 1, 2019

JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.

/s/ Paul J. Orfanedes

Robert D. Popper

D.C. Bar No. 1023592

Paul J. Orfanedes

D.C. Bar No. 429716

425 Third Street SW, Suite 800

Washington, DC 20024

(202) 646-5172

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH H. HUNT

Assistant Attorney General

JENNIFER D. RICKETTS

Director

Federal Programs Branch

CHRISTOPHER R. HALL

Assistant Director

Federal Programs Branch

/s/ M. Andrew Zee

M. ANDREW ZEE

Trial Attorney (California Bar No. 272510)

United States Department of Justice

Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch

450 Golden Gate Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94102

Telephone: (415) 436-6646

m.andrew.zee@usdoj.gov

*Counsel for Defendants*

# **Exhibit 1**

**RECEIVED**

**06-13-90009**

**JUN 27 2019**

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

**OFFICE OF THE  
CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE**

**In re Complaint of Judicial Misconduct**

)  
)  
)

**ORDER**

**BEFORE:** COLE, Chief Circuit Judge, MOORE, SUTTON, KETHLEDGE, STRANCH, DONALD and BUSH, Circuit Judges; HOOD, GAUGHAN, CALDWELL, JONKER, ANDERSON, REEVES, STIVERS, and CRENSHAW, Chief District Judges.<sup>1</sup>

This matter is before the Judicial Council of the Sixth Circuit, pursuant to its June 27, 2018 order regarding the misconduct complaint against Judge John R. Adams of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio. As explained in the June 2018 order, the Judicial Council imposed no further sanctions and instead retained jurisdiction to review the matter in one year. Consistent with that directive, the Judicial Council upon review concludes that no further misconduct by Judge Adams has occurred. Thus, the Judicial Council hereby dismisses the complaint against Judge Adams, leaving in place the prior unchallenged components of the original misconduct order of February 22, 2016, and noting that the judges of the Northern District of Ohio unanimously favor this result.

As of the date of this order, the Judicial Council's jurisdiction over this matter is terminated, and the challenged requirements of the February 22, 2016 order, including the directive that Judge Adams undergo a mental health evaluation, are no longer in effect.

Dated: June 27, 2019

**IT IS SO ORDERED**

---

<sup>1</sup> Edmund A. Sargus, Jr., Chief District Judge, recused himself from this matter; Richard A. Griffin and Amul R. Thapar, Circuit Judges, abstained; Julia S. Gibbons, Circuit Judge, was unavailable to participate.